

The Name *Incarvillea arguta*

BY

B. L. BURTT AND A. J. C. GRIERSON

When investigating the dates of publication of Royle's Illustrations of the Botany of the Himalayan Mountains, Dr. T. A. Sprague pointed out (Kew Bull. 1933, 386) that plate 72, fig. 1, of that work was published in 1835, while the corresponding text did not appear till the year following. The plate included dissections of the plant illustrated, and was therefore sufficient to validate its name, which Sprague gave as *Incarvillea diffusa*. Sprague was prepared to accept the genus *Amphicome* as distinct from *Incarvillea*, and accordingly made a new combination *Amphicome diffusa* (Royle) Sprague.

It has now come to light that the copy of Royle's work examined by Dr. Sprague (that in the library of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew) is exceptional in having this particular plate labelled *Incarvillea diffusa*. Six other copies have been examined, two in the library of the Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh, three in the Lindley Library of the Royal Horticultural Society (for information about which we are indebted to Mr. W. T. Stearn) and one at the Linnean Society of London (examined on our behalf by Mr. O'Grady): in all these plate 72, fig. 1, is labelled *Amphicome arguta*. That this was Royle's intention at that time is emphasised by three facts: first, that the name *Amphicome arguta* (as we are informed by Mr. Stearn) appears on the original wrapper of the part concerned; secondly, by the reference in the text, where the entry is "*Incarvillea* (*Amphicome*) *arguta*; . . . [here follows a brief Latin diagnosis] . . . *Amphicome arguta*. Tab. 72, fig. 1"; thirdly, by the use of the name *Amphicome arguta* in the list of illustrations.

The sequence of events appears to have been that Royle at first named his plant as a new species of *Incarvillea*, *I. diffusa* Royle, and this name was inscribed on the plates. Subsequently he observed the differences between it and the species of *Incarvillea* described previously, and as a result he segregated his plant as a distinct genus and called it *Amphicome arguta*. The name *Incarvillea diffusa* was accordingly erased from the plates (there is evidence of this on the paper, though it has been very skilfully done), and *Amphicome arguta* was substituted. The plants were submitted, however, to Robert Brown and his opinion, that *Amphicome* should only rank as a subgenus of *Incarvillea*, became available in time to incorporate it in the text.

Brown supplied Royle with an amended description of *Incarvillea* and diagnoses of its two subgenera *Incarvillea* and *Amphicome*. As Brown's work was published verbatim by Royle, *Incarvillea* subgenus *Amphicome* should be attributed to R. Brown. The description of the species was, however, Royle's own, and he is responsible for the specific name used in the text, *Incarvillea arguta*.

The plate, which as already mentioned appeared in 1835, validates the genus *Amphicome* Royle and the species *Amphicome arguta* Royle.

One of us (A. G.) is revising the genus *Incarvillea* and is inclined to Robert Brown's view, which only allows *Amphicome* subgeneric rank. Chatterjee (in Kew Bull. 1948, 183) has recently stated the same opinion. It should be

noted that, working from the Kew copy of Royle, he accepts *Incarvillea diffusa* as the published name for tab. 72, fig. 1. This not only leads to the adoption of the wrong specific epithet, but to attributing *Amphicome* as a genus to the next author who accepted it, namely G. Don, instead of to Royle himself. Accepting *Amphicome* as a subgenus of *Incarvillea*, the nomenclatural results of this note may be summarised:—

INCARVILLEA subgenus AMPHICOME (Royle) R. Br. apud Royle, Ill. Bot. Him. 296 (1836).

Syn. *Amphicome* Royle, Ill. Bot. Him. Pl. t. 72, fig. 1 (1835); G. Don, Gen. Syst., iv, 655 (1837).

Type species of subgenus:—

I. ARGUTA (Royle) Royle, Ill. Bot. Him. 296 (1836).

Syn. *Amphicome arguta* Royle, Ill. Bot. Him. t. 72, fig. 1 (1835).

Incarvillea diffusa Royle, Ill. Bot. Him. t. 72, fig. 1 (1835)—only seen in one copy; Chatterjee in Kew Bull. 1948, 185 and in Bull. Bot. Soc. Bengal, ii, 63 (1948).

Amphicome diffusa (Royle) Sprague in Kew Bull. 1933, 386.

It remains to point out that Mr. W. T. Stearn has already discussed (Journ. Arn. Arb. xxiv, 186: 1943) a similar instance of variation in the lettering of Royle's illustrations, plate 92 having appeared as *Lilium Thomsonianum* or *Fritillaria Thomsoniana*. The latter is the amended name, following D. Don's decision on the taxonomy of the plant concerned, but two copies (at the Arnold Arboretum and, as in the case of *Amphicome*, at Kew) apparently escaped correction.